

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 20, 37-44, 51, 53-56, 62, 64-70, 83, 91-98, 105, 107-111, 125, 126, and 134 are pending; Claims 1, 3, 6, 37, 51, 64, 69, 91, 105, and 125 are independent. Claims 134-147 were previously added. Claims 52 and 106 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-7, 20, 37, 44, 51, 53-56, 62, 64-67, 69-70, 91, 95-98, 105, 111, 125, 126, and 134 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 REJECTIONS

Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 for failing to enable the embodiment described in the claim. Specifically, Claim 64 is rejected for containing a single means limitation. Claim 64 has been amended in a manner which renders this rejection moot; applicants respectfully request that it be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) REJECTIONS

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 20, 37-41, 51, 53, 54, 64-65, 68-70, 83, 91-95, 105, 107-110, 125-126, and 134 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Arora, U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/00114049.

As regards Claims 1-2, 5-7, 20, 37-41, 64-65, 68-70, 83, 91-95, and 134, the Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1, which, as amended, recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to:

A method, comprising:
receiving metadata associated with a media stream from a remote database; and
in response to said metadata, adjusting masking elements of a

display screen.

Independent Claims 6, 37, 64, 69, and 91 recite similar limitations. Claims 2, 5, 7, 20, 38-41, 65, 68, 70, 83, 92-95, and 134 are dependent upon one or another of these independent Claims, and recite further features of the claimed embodiments.

The present rejection suggests that Arora recites every limitation of the pending Claims. Applicants respectfully contend that Arora fails to teach or suggest a method comprising adjusting masking elements of a display screen, in response to a metadata, as claimed.

Applicants understand Arora to purport to describe an approach for excluding extraneous portions of an analog video stream (Abstract). Specifically, the described approach involves modifying the aspect ratio of the video stream by processing the video stream to remove the black bars sometimes used to present widescreen video content on a 4:3 aspect ratio display (*see, e.g.*, [0010], [0020]). The approach of Arora is thus very clearly directed towards modifying a video stream.

The rejection, referencing Claim 37, suggests that Arora describes manipulating masking elements. Applicants respectfully disagree. The portion of Arora cited discusses the inclusion of black bars in the video stream to take up extra frame space. Other portions of Arora discuss removal of these black bars, as noted above. Neither discussion involves manipulating masking elements *of a display screen*, as claimed; the “black bars” are incorporated into (and deleted from) the video stream, rather than the

display.

As regards Claims 51, 53-54, 105, and 107-110, the Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 51, which, as amended, recites that an embodiment is directed to:

A method, comprising:

receiving metadata associated with a video stream from a first database; and

adjusting the viewable area of a display, with reference to said metadata, in order to accommodate a first and a second element of said video stream,

wherein said first database comprises information associating the first element of the media stream with some combination of aspect ratio, horizontal size, vertical size, resolution, anamorphic compression, and letterboxing.

Independent Claim 105 recites similar limitations. Claims 53-54 and 107-110 are dependent on one or the other of these independent Claims, and recite further features of the claimed embodiments.

The present rejection suggests that Arora recites every limitation of the pending Claims. Applicants respectfully contend that Arora fails to teach or suggest a method including adjusting the viewable area of a display, as claimed.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to Applicants' understanding of Arora, above. The rejection suggests that Arora describes adjusting the viewable area of a display, and references a discussion of using black bars to fit widescreen (e.g., 16x9) content into a full-screen (e.g., 4x3) presentation. Applicants respectfully contend that stripping the black bars out of a video stream is not analogous to adjusting the viewable

area of a display. Moreover, Applicants contend that Arora does not teach or suggest adjusting the viewable area of a display, with reference to metadata associated with a video stream received from a first database, as claimed. The video stream discussed in Arora at the cited point simply includes portions which happen to be black bars; no adjustment of the display area is made as a result.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Arora fails to anticipate or render obvious the limitations of the claimed embodiments.

As regards Claims 125-126, the Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 125, which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to:

Apparatus including

means for generating a request, said request indicating a media stream available from a first server;

means for transmitting said request from said first server to a second server; and

means for identifying at least one media stream and at least one set of metadata associated with said request, said metadata including at least one set of aspect ratio information.

Claim 126 is dependent upon claim 125, and recites further features of the claimed embodiments.

The present rejection suggests that Arora recites every limitation of the pending Claims. Applicants respectfully disagree, and contend that Arora fails to teach or suggest means for generating a request indicating a media stream available from a first server, as claimed.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to Applicants' understanding of Arora, above. Applicants further note that Arora does not teach or suggest requesting media streams available from a server, as claimed. The rejection cites to a portion of Arora, where a discussion of the operation of the MPEG encoder 420 is described. While MPEG encoder 420 is described as being able to store frames of MPEG video data after they have been processed, Applicants do not read this portion of Arora as describing a means for generating a request indicating a media stream available from a server, as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully contend that Arora fails to anticipate or render obvious the limitations recited in the claimed embodiments.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully contend that Claims 1-2, 5-7, 20, 37-41, 51, 53-54, 64-65, 68-70, 83, 91-95, 105, 107-110, 125-126, and 134 overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and are in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS

Claims 3-4, 43, 66-67, and 97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Arora, in view of Sie et al., U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0212731.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 3, which recites that an embodiment is directed to:

A method, including steps of
adjusting an aspect ratio of a display screen in response to input
from a viewer; and
sending the adjusted aspect ratio to a remote database.

Independent Claims 1, 37, 64, and 91 recite similar limitations. Claims 4, 43, 66-67, and 217 1023.02
Examiner: Sweeney, P. 35 Serial No: 10/564,811
Art Unit: 2162

97 are dependent upon one or another of these independent claims, and recite further features of the claimed embodiments.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to the analysis of Arora presented above as regards Claim 1. As discussed therein, Applicants respectfully contend that Arora fails to teach or suggest adjusting an aspect ratio of a display screen, as claimed. Sie fails to remedy this defect in Arora, as Sie similarly fails to teach or suggest adjusting an aspect ratio of a display screen, as claimed.

Therefore, Arora, alone or in combination with Sie, fails to anticipate or render obvious the limitations of the claimed embodiments. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully contend that Claims 3-4, 43, 66-67, and 97 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

KALEIDESCAPE, INC.

Date: June 19, 2009

/Kevin Brown/

Kevin A. Brown
Reg. No. 56,303
IP Counsel, Kaleidescape, Inc.
440 Potrero Ave.
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4117
(650) 625-6391